PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	Tuolumne County Resource Conservation District	**Amount Requested**	$ 3,640,000
Proposal Title	Tuolumne-Stanislaus IRWM Region Proposition 84 Round 2 Implementation Grant Proposal	**Total Proposal Cost**	$ 4,633,266

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal includes the following eight projects: (1) Murphy's Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Facilities Improvement Project (Sprayfield), (2) Stanislaus National Forest Upper South Fork Stanislaus River Watershed Restoration and Water Quality Enhancement Project, (3) Tuolumne County Resource Conservation District Small Acreage Storm Water Pollution Prevention and Landowner Stewardship Program, (4) Amador-Tuolumne Community Action Agency Home-Level Water Conservation for the DAC, (5) Tuolumne Utilities District Phoenix Lake Preservation and Restoration Phase 2, (6) Tuolumne River Trust Tuolumne Stanislaus Watershed Outreach and Education, (7) Calaveras County Water District Douglas Flat/Vallecito Wastewater Treatment Plant Storage Pond Project, and (8) Groveland Community Services District GCSD/BOF (LS#16) Water Quality Protection Project.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	15/15	Technical Justification	6/10
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	5/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	18/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	10/10
		Total Score (max. possible = 80)	**60**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The purpose and need for the projects, as well as their integration, is described in the introduction of the work plan section. Project tasks are of adequate detail and completeness so that it is clear that each project can be implemented. The tasks for each project include appropriate deliverables and reporting submittals, and collectively implement the proposed projects. The work plan includes a list of permits and CEQA documentation needed and their status. Detailed supporting documentation is included for each project within the work plan. For projects collecting data, project

proposals listed in the work plan include Data Management and Monitoring Deliverables that are consistent with the IRWM Plan Standards and Guidance for Data Management Standard.

BUDGET

Budgets for more than half of the projects in the proposal have detailed cost information, but not all costs are considered reasonable and task budgets lack supporting documentation. For example, Project 5 (page 32) is lacking backup documentation for the grant fund request for Task 6 (totaling about $800,000). Backup documentation for equipment/material costs, as well as matching funds, are missing from many of the project budgets.

SCHEDULE

The schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction of one component of the proposal by September 2013 and the remaining construction tasks will begin after April 1, 2014. The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget. Given task descriptions, the schedule seems reasonable.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Not all monitoring targets are appropriate for the benefits claimed. For example, appropriate numeric targets are not presented for Project 1 or Project 5. Also, although water quality improvement is a primary benefit of both Projects 7 and 8, no measurable target is provided for this benefit.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits, but is either not fully supported by documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the projects or the physical benefits are not well described. References were only provided for four of the eight projects and several projects lack the quantification of the without project impacts. Projects 1 and 5 both appear to provide water quality benefits; however, adequate technical documentation is not provided. The applicant provides information that identifies and describes the physical benefits of each project included in the proposal and includes a summary of the benefits, the recent and historical conditions, without-project conditions, and methodologies for each project.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost. The proposal did not include monetized benefits for any projects. Wastewater treatment and disposal projects provided information on alternatives to demonstrate cost-effectiveness. Reviewer's opinion is that several of the projects could have provided an estimate of monetized benefit such as using an avoided cost method. The reservoir restoration project increases storage capacity and therefore available supply to residents (as described), and this water supply benefit should have been monetized or compared to alternatives in a cost-effectiveness analysis. Some demonstration that the full, constructed project would provide net benefit or would be cost-effective is needed to judge whether the intermediate design phase is a good use of funds.

Proposal did a good job of describing non-monetized benefits. These vary by project including water quality and environmental benefits, education, conflict avoidance, water supply reliability, and long-term solutions. Benefits of projects still in planning stages will not be realized by the phases proposed for funding in this proposal.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that five program preferences and eight statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for 12 of the Preferences claimed: (1) Include regional projects or programs ; (2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region identified in the CWP; RWQCB region or subdivision; or other region or sub-region specifically identified by DWR; (3) Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; (4) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; (5) Effectively integrate water management with land use planning; (6) Drought Preparedness; (7) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (8) Climate Change Response Actions; (9) Expand Environmental Stewardship; (10) Practice Integrated Flood Management; (11) Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality; and (12) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.